



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/814,188	04/01/2004	Katsumi Nishijima	8001-1195	6415
<small>465</small> YOUNG & THOMPSON 209 Madison Street Suite 500 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			<small>7590</small> EXAMINER WENDELL, ANDREW	
			<small>2618</small> ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			08/19/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/814,188

Applicant(s)

NISHIJIMA ET AL.

Examiner

ANDREW WENDELL

Art Unit

2618

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 May 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 18-19, and 24-28 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishimura (US Pat Pub# 2006/0063570) in view of Gauld et al. (US Pat Pub# 2004/0198435) and further in view of Kfoury (US Pat# 6,549,789).

Regarding claim 1, Nishimura's portable apparatus teaches a mobile terminal 100 (Fig. 1), comprising a control unit 99 (Fig. 1; Section 0033; obvious there is a control unit to have communication); a display unit 54 and 4 (Fig. 1); an upper housing 51 (Fig. 1); a lower housing 2 (Fig. 1); and a 2-axis hinge unit 3 and 11 (Fig. 3) for coupling the housings 2 and 51 (Fig. 1); wherein an end portion of the 2-axis hinge unit 2 and 51 (Fig. 2) is exposed outside the terminal 1, 4, and 6 (Fig. 2), and an information input device 4 and 6 (Fig. 2) is mounted in the end portion. Nishimura fails to teach a pointing device, a 2-axis hinge unit connected to the lower housing, and a control unit.

Gauld's camera integration on a mobile device teaches a pointing device 17 (Fig. 1) and a control unit 104 (Fig. 4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a pointing

device as taught by Gauld into Nishimura's portable apparatus in order to provide an intuitive user interface (Sections 0013-0014).

Nishimura and Gauld fail to teach a 2-axis hinge unit connected to the lower housing.

Kfoury teaches a 2-axis hinge unit (Fig. 4) coupling the housings 204 and 202 (Figs. 6 and 7) for swinging movement of the upper housing relative to the lower housing about intersecting axes (Fig. 8 and 9) both of which are fixed relative to the lower housing 202 and 214 (Figs. 6 and 7).

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a 2-axis hinge unit connected to the lower housing as taught by Kfoury into a pointing device as taught by Gauld into Nishimura's portable apparatus in order to improve adaptability of user interfaces and reducing manufacturing time and costs (Col. 2 lines 13-16).

Regarding claim 2, Gauld further teaches wherein the control unit 104 (Fig. 4) controls the terminal according to an operation of the information input device 16 (Fig. 2).

Regarding claim 3, Gauld further teaches wherein the control unit 104 (Fig. 4) assigns a predetermined function to the information input device (Section 0015).

Regarding claim 5, Gauld further teaches wherein the control unit 104 (Fig. 4) assigns another operating function to the pointing device 17 (Fig. 1 and Sections 0024 and 0044).

Regarding claim 6, Gauld further teaches wherein the information input device 17 (Fig. 1) further comprises a terminal operating function (Section 0024).

Regarding claim 7, Gauld further teaches wherein the terminal operating function is performed by a press (Section 0024). Note, the user has to perform the function, so a press or some pressure has to be performed for a user to have function.

Regarding claim 18, Gauld further teaches wherein the control unit detects an operation of a predetermined operation key to control an operation of the information input device (Section 0015).

Regarding claim 19, Gauld further teaches wherein the control unit controls an operation of the information input device while a predetermined operation key is operated (Section 0015).

Regarding claim 24, Nishimura further teaches wherein the terminal is a mobile telephone 100 (Fig. 1).

Regarding claim 25, Nishimura further teaches wherein the two axes of the 2-axis hinge are a folding axis and a horizontal rotation axis (Fig. 3), the upper housing 51 (Fig. 3), the lower housing 2 (Fig. 3) and the 2-axis hinge being constructed and arranged so that the end portion of the 2-axis hinge on the horizontal rotation axis is exposed to an outside of the mobile terminal both when the mobile terminal is in an open position and when the mobile terminal is in a closed position (Figs. 2, 5, and 7).

Regarding claim 26, Nishimura further teaches wherein the end portion is exposed on a side face of the lower housing (Fig. 3).

Regarding claim 27, Nishimura further teaches wherein the information device is arranged on the end portion of the 2-axis hinge (Figs. 3 and 5).

Regarding claim 28, Nishimura teaches a lower housing 2 (Fig. 3); a 2-axis hinge 11 and 3 (Fig. 3) the connected to the lower housing 2 (Fig. 3); an upper housing 51 (Fig. 3) connected to the 2-axis hinge 3 and 11 (Fig. 3); a display unit 54 (Fig. 3) disposed on the upper housing 51 (Fig. 3); a control unit 99 (Fig. 1; Section 0033; obvious there is a control unit to have communication); and wherein an end portion of the 2-axis hinge unit 3 and 11 (Fig. 3) is exposed outside the terminal 4 (Fig 3) and 6 (Fig. 5), the information input device 4 (Fig 3) and 6 (Fig. 5) is mounted in the end portion. Nishimura fails to teach a button, a 2-axis hinge unit connected to the lower housing, and a control unit.

Gauld teaches a button 16 (Fig. 4) or 17 (Fig. 1) operatively connected to the control unit 104 (Fig. 4) for user input.

Gauld and Nishimura fails to teach a 2-axis hinge unit connected to the lower housing.

Kfoury teaches a 2-axis hinge (Figs. 4 and 8-9) connected to the lower housing and providing two intersecting hinge axes that are fixed relative to said lower housing 202 and 214 (Fig. 6 and 7).

3. Claims 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishimura (US Pat Pub# 2006/0063570) in view of Gauld et al. (US Pat Pub# 2004/0198435) and further in view of Kfoury (US Pat# 6,549,789) and further in view of Schmitt et al. (US Pat# 6,088,585).

Regarding claim 8, Nishimura's portable apparatus in view of Gauld's camera integration on a mobile device and further in view of Kfoury teaches the limitations in claim 1. Nishimura, Kfoury, and Gauld fail to teach a fingerprint sensor.

Schmitt's portable telecommunication device including a fingerprint sensor teaches a fingerprint sensor 30 (Fig. 14).

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a fingerprint sensor as taught by Schmitt into a 2-axis hinge unit connected to the lower housing as taught by Kfoury into a pointing device as taught by Gauld into Nishimura's portable apparatus in order to increase security and reliability (Col. 3 lines 3-11).

Regarding claim 9, the combination including Schmitt teaches wherein the control unit 207 (Fig. 15) can operate the terminal 190 (Fig. 15) when the fingerprint sensor 30 (Fig. 15) detects a predetermined input.

4. Claims 10-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishimura (US Pat Pub# 2006/0063570) in view of Gauld et al. (US Pat Pub# 2004/0198435) and further in view of Kfoury (US Pat# 6,549,789) and further in view of Kim (US Pat# 6,621,066).

Regarding claim 10, Nishimura's portable apparatus in view of Gauld's camera integration on a mobile device and further in view of Kfoury teaches the limitations in claim 1. Nishimura, Kfoury, and Gauld fail to teach position detection means.

Kim's optimizing opening and closing control of a sub-body in automatic and manual folder type mobile communication terminals teaches position detection means

236, 238, 300 and 302 (Fig. 4) for detecting relative positions between the upper housing and the lower housing

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a sensor detection means as taught by Kim into a 2-axis hinge unit connected to the lower housing as taught by Kfoury into a pointing device as taught by Gauld into Nishimura's portable apparatus in order to have a more efficient and precise control for opening or closing the sub-body folder upon using of the terminal (Col. 1 lines 51-61).

Regarding claim 11, Kim further teaches wherein the control unit 200 (Fig. 3) controls the terminal based on an output of the position detection means 236 and 238 (Fig. 3).

Regarding claim 12, Gauld further teaches wherein the control unit 104 (Fig. 4) controls an operation of the information input device 16 (Fig. 4).

Regarding claim 13, Kim further teaches wherein the position detection means comprise a magnet 300 and 302 (Fig. 4) and a magnetic sensor 236 and 238 (Fig. 4).

Regarding claim 14, Kim further teaches wherein the magnet 300 and 302 (Fig. 4) and the magnetic sensor 236 and 238 (Fig. 4) are arranged in separate housings (Fig. 4).

Regarding claim 15, Kim further teaches wherein the magnetic sensor is a Hall element (Fig. 4).

Regarding claim 16, Kim further teaches wherein the position detection means detect a turning direction of the housings (Col. 2 line 1-Col. 3 line18).

5. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishimura (US Pat Pub# 2006/0063570) in view of Gauld et al. (US Pat Pub# 2004/0198435) and further in view of Kfoury (US Pat# 6,549,789) and further in view of Kim (US Pat# 6,621,066) and further in view of Ikeda et al. (US Pat# 6,957,083).

Regarding claim 17, Nishimura's portable apparatus in view of Gauld's camera integration on a mobile device and further in view of Kfoury and further in view of Kim's optimizing opening and closing control of a sub-body in automatic and manual folder type mobile communication terminals teaches the limitations in claims 1, 10, and 16. Nishimura, Kim, Kfoury, and Gauld fail to teach a control unit controls the display unit based on the turning direction of the housings.

Ikeda's mobile telephone teaches wherein the control unit controls the display unit based on the turning direction of the housings (Col. 1 line 57-Col. 2 line 44 and Col. 3 line 41-Col. 5 line 60).

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a control unit controls the display unit based on the turning direction of the housings as taught by Ikeda into a sensor detection means as taught by Kim into a 2-axis hinge unit connected to the lower housing as taught by Kfoury into a pointing device as taught by Gauld into Nishimura's portable apparatus in order to make using the camera easier to use (Col. 1 lines 42-56).

6. Claims 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishimura (US Pat Pub# 2006/0063570) in view of Gauld et al. (US Pat Pub#

2004/0198435) and further in view of Kfoury (US Pat# 6,549,789) and further in view of Wada et al. (US Pat Pub# 2003/0174240).

Regarding claim 20, Nishimura's portable apparatus in view of Gauld's camera integration on a mobile device and further in view of Kfoury teaches the limitations in claim 1. Nishimura, Kfoury, and Gauld fail to teach a lock unit.

Wada's mobile telephone teaches a lock unit for locking the 2-axis hinge unit (Section 0055).

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a lock unit as taught by Wada into a 2-axis hinge unit connected to the lower housing as taught by Kfoury into a pointing device as taught by Gauld into Nishimura's portable apparatus in order to increase security (Section 0017 and 0056).

Regarding claim 21, Wada further teaches wherein the lock unit is controlled by an input from the information input device (Section 0055).

Regarding claim 22, Wada further teaches wherein the information input device is a personal authentication sensor (Section 0055); and the lock unit is released when the sensor detects a predetermined input (Section 0055).

7. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishimura (US Pat Pub# 2006/0063570) in view of Gauld et al. (US Pat Pub# 2004/0198435) and further in view of Kfoury (US Pat# 6,549,789) and further in view of Wada et al. (US Pat Pub# 2003/0174240) and further in view of Schmitt et al. (US Pat# 6,088,585).

Regarding claim 23, Nishimura's portable apparatus in view of Gauld's camera integration on a mobile device and further in view of Kfoury and further in view of Wada's mobile telephone teaches the limitations in claims 1 and 20-22. Nishimura, Gauld, Kfoury, and Wada fail to teach a fingerprint sensor.

Schmitt's portable telecommunication device including a fingerprint sensor teaches a fingerprint sensor 30 (Fig. 14).

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a lock unit as taught by Wada into a fingerprint sensor as taught by Schmitt into a 2-axis hinge unit connected to the lower housing as taught by Kfoury into a pointing device as taught by Gauld into Nishimura's portable apparatus in order to increase security and reliability (Col. 3 lines 3-11).

8. Claims 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishimura (US Pat Pub# 2006/0063570) in view of Kfoury (US Pat# 6,549,789).

Regarding claim 29, Nishimura teaches a two-axis hinge 3 and 11 (Fig. 3) having a horizontal rotating axis and a folding axis for coupling the upper housing 51 (Fig. 3) and the lower housing 2 (Fig. 3), and adapting the housings for foldable rotation around the folding axis or an open-close operation (Figs. 3 and 5-6) and for horizontal rotation around the horizontal rotation axis (Figs. 3 and 7-9); and an information input device 4 (Fig. 3) and 6 (Fig. 5) arranged on top of one end portion of the horizontal rotation axis 3 and 11 (Fig. 3), the input device 4 (Fig. 3) and 6 (Fig. 5) being exposed to an outside of the mobile terminal both when the mobile terminal is in a closed position and when

the mobile terminal is in an open position (Figs. 3, 5-6, 21-22, and 23-24). Nishimura fails to teach a two-axis hinge both being fixed relative to the lower housing.

Kfoury teaches a two--axis hinge (Fig. 4) having a horizontal rotation axis (Fig. 8) and a folding axis (Fig. 9) for coupling the upper housing 204 (Figs. 6 and 7) and the lower housing 202 (Figs. 6 and 7), and adapting the housings for foldable rotation around the folding axis for an open--close operation (Fig. 9) and for horizontal rotation around the horizontal rotation axis (Fig. 8), both said axes being fixed relative to said lower housing 202 and 214 (Figs. 6 and 7).

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a two-axis hinge both being fixed relative to the lower housing as taught by Kfoury into Nishimura's portable apparatus in order to improve adaptability of user interfaces and reducing manufacturing time and costs (Col. 2 lines 13-16).

Regarding claim 30, the combination including Nishimura teaches wherein the horizontal rotation axis 11 (Fig. 3) is mounted on the lower housing 2 (Fig. 3) with another end portion making a right angle with a surface of the housings 2 and 51 (Fig. 3); and the folding axis 3 (Fig. 3) is mounted in the upper housing 51 (Fig. 3), and is joined together with the horizontal rotation axis 11 (Fig. 3) by crossing through the horizontal rotation axis at a right angle for providing the foldable rotation and the horizontal rotation to the upper housing (Figs. 1-3).

9. Claims 31 and 34-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishimura (US Pat Pub# 2006/0063570) in view of Kfoury (US Pat# 6,549,789) and further in view of Kim (US Pat# 6,621,066).

Regarding claim 31, Nishimura in view of Kfoury teaches the limitations in claims 29-30. Nishimura and Kfoury fails to teach a detection unit.

Kim teaches a position detection unit 236, 238, 300 and 302 (Fig. 4) for detecting one of relative positions between the upper housing 120 (Fig. 1A) and the lower housing 110 (Fig. 1A), wherein the relative positions include a first position in which the upper housing is closed and overlaid on the lower housing and wherein the display unit and the operation key unit are facing each other, a second position in which the upper housing is opened from the first position by the foldable rotation, a third position in which the upper housing is turned 180 degrees from the first position by the horizontal rotation, a fourth position in which the upper housing is turned 90 degrees from the second position by the horizontal rotation, and fifth position in which the upper housing is further turned 90 degrees from the fourth position by the horizontal rotation (Figs. 3-4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a sensor detection means as taught by Kim into a two-axis hinge both being fixed relative to the lower housing as taught by Kfoury into Nishimura's portable apparatus in order to have a more efficient and precise control for opening or closing the sub-body folder upon using of the terminal (Col. 1 lines 51-61).

Regarding claim 34, Kim further teaches wherein the position detection unit comprises a magnet 300 and 302 (Fig. 4) and a magnet sensor 236 and 238 (Fig. 4) each arranged in a different the housing from each other (Fig. 4).

Regarding claim 35, Kim further teaches wherein the magnet sensor is a Hall element (Fig. 4).

10. Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishimura (US Pat Pub# 2006/0063570) in view of Kfoury (US Pat# 6,549,789) and further in view of Kim (US Pat# 6,621,066) and further in view of Gauld et al. (US Pat Pub# 2004/0198435).

Regarding claim 32, Nishimura in view of Kfoury and further in view of Kim teaches the limitations in claims 29-31. Nishimura, Kfoury, and Kim fail to teach a pointing device.

Gauld teaches wherein the information input device is a pointing device 17 (Fig. 1) for selecting a pointer shown on the display unit 14 (Fig. 1), and the mobile terminal further comprising a control unit 104 (Fig. 4) to control an operation of the pointing device so as to disable the operation of the pointing device.

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a pointing device as taught by Gauld into a sensor detection means as taught by Kim into a two-axis hinge both being fixed relative to the lower housing as taught by Kfoury into Nishimura's portable apparatus in order to provide an intuitive user interface (Sections 0013-0014).

11. Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishimura (US Pat Pub# 2006/0063570) in view of Kfoury (US Pat# 6,549,789) and further in view of Kim (US Pat# 6,621,066) and further in view of Gauld et al. (US Pat Pub# 2004/0198435) and further in view of Ikeda et al. (US Pat# 6,957,083).

Regarding claim 33, Nishimura in view of Kfoury and further in view of Kim and further in view of Gauld teaches the limitations in claims 29-32. Nishimura, Gauld, Kfoury, and Kim fail to teach a control unit controls the display unit based on the turning direction of the housings.

Ikeda teaches wherein the control unit controls a display operation based on the pointing device so as to select the pointer on the display unit of an opposite direction of right and left when the third position is detected by the position detection unit (Col. 1 line 57-Col. 2 line 44 and Col. 3 line 41-Col. 5 line 60).

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a control unit controls the display unit based on the turning direction of the housings as taught by Ikeda into a pointing device as taught by Gauld into a sensor detection means as taught by Kim into a two-axis hinge both being fixed relative to the lower housing as taught by Kfoury into Nishimura's portable apparatus in order to make using the camera easier to use (Col. 1 lines 42-56).

12. Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishimura (US Pat Pub# 2006/0063570) in view of Kfoury (US Pat# 6,549,789) and further in view of Schmitt et al. (US Pat# 6,088,585).

Regarding claim 36, Nishimura in view of Kfoury teaches the limitations in claim

29. Nishimura and Kfoury fail to teach a fingerprint sensor.

Schmitt teaches a fingerprint sensor 30 (Fig. 14).

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a fingerprint sensor as taught by Schmitt into a two-axis hinge both being fixed relative to the lower housing as taught by Kfoury into Nishimura's portable apparatus in order to increase security and reliability (Col. 3 lines 3-11).

Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3 and 5-36 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

14. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANDREW WENDELL whose telephone number is (571)272-0557. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nay Maung can be reached on 571-272-7882. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Andrew Wendell/
Examiner, Art Unit 2618

/Nay A. Maung/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 2618

8/10/2008